DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 790 SP 026 030

AUTHOR Carver, Fred D.; Krajewski, Robert J.
TITLE Organization and Operation of Teacher Education Programs: Implications for Change in Professional Education Preparation.
PUB DATE 28 Feb 85
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Denver, CO, February 27-March 2, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Administration; Degrees (Academic); Higher Education; Institutional Autonomy; *Institutional Characteristics; *Policy Formation; *Schools of Education; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Educators

ABSTRACT

A survey conducted in 1983-84 of American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education member institutions sought information regarding teacher education policy and organizational/structural practices. Questionnaires contained four questions about institutional characteristics, and five questions about general organization for teacher education programs, one of which concerned the locus of responsibility for offering selected courses, advising students, and supervising student teachers in six program areas. Statistics were tabulated and responses analyzed for each of the questions. Findings indicated: (1) teacher preparation is decentralized and complex across the nation; fluctuating supply and demand, geographic mobility among students and graduates, and an evolving view of appropriate components contribute to significant commonalities in teacher education programs; (2) teacher preparation involves faculty from throughout the college/university, thus teacher preparation is an institutional function; (3) only 46 percent of institutions have separate programs of general education for teacher preparation; (4) policy responsibility lies with education professors in 58 percent of the institutions; and (5) teacher preparation program control is a shared responsibility in varying, complex ways and to varying degrees in higher education institutions. Recommendations for improvements for teacher preparation programs are suggested in a discussion of the implications of the findings. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS: IMPLICATIONS FOR CHANGE IN PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION PREPARATION

A paper prepared by

Fred D. Carver, Professor and Dean
College of Education
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

and

Robert J. Krajewski, Professor and Department Head
Educational Administration and Counseling
College of Education
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

For presentation at: 1985 AACTE Annual Meeting
Denver, Colorado

February 28, 1985

ISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
RIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F.D. Carver

E EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
MATION CENTER (ERIC)."

S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
ATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
s document has been reproduced as
eived from the person or organization
ginating it
or changes have been made to improve
roduction quality

nts of view or opinions stated in this docu
nt do not necessarily represent official NIE
ition or policy

Organization and Operation of Teacher Education Programs: Implications for Change in Professional Education Preparation*

Fred D. Carver
and
Robert J. Krajewski
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Introduction

Recent concerns about the effectiveness and direction of public education has naturally led to a renewed focus on teacher preparation programs. Who determines teacher education policy becomes one of the key issues. Some debaters assert that professors of education should and do control policy, and others insist that liberal arts professors assume a significant role. It is useful to develop an understanding of the common characteristics of organization for the operation of teacher education programs as a context for innovation and leadership. In addition, it is important to determine not only the number of education graduates and the type of institutions from which they come, but also to analyze the relationships between and among these and related variables.

In academic year 1983-84, the authors surveyed American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) member institutions to obtain current information regarding teacher education policy and organizational/structural practices. Surveys mailed to chief institutional representatives contained four questions about institutional characteristics, and five questions about the general organization for teacher education programs, one of which concerned the the locus of responsibility for offering selected courses, advising students, and supervising student teachers for six program areas. Of the then 737 AACTE

*We are indebted to Dr. David Imig, Executive Director of the AACTE, for his assistance in providing mailing labels to institutional representatives.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

member colleges and univesities, 652 (88.5%) returned usable questionnaires.

Among the respondents were representatives from all fifty states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. Questionnaires were sent to but not received from institutions in the Virgin Islands and Guam. Each state was represented by at least one major state university and/or one or more state and private college(s). Returns from such prestigious non-public institutions as the University of Chicago, Teachers College-Columbia University, Harvard University, and Boston College were included.

Institutional Characteristics

Three hundred forty three (52.6%) institutions classified themselves as public and 309 (47.4%) as non-public. Almost one-fourth (158, 24.2%) were universities that grant doctoral degrees in education, nearly one-third (207, 31.7%) were universities without doctoral programs in education and close to one-half (287, 44.0%) were four year colleges. The sample is described in terms of the number of first year teachers prepared and the total enrollment in 1982-83 in Tables 1 and 2 respectively.

Table 1. New Teachers Prepared in 1982-83

New Teachers Prepared	No. of Institutions Reporting	% of Total
Fewer than 100	282	43.3%
101-249	175	26.8
250-449	134	20.6
500-749	33	5.1
750 and more	28	4.3
TOTAL	652	100.0%

Table 2. Total Enrollment in 1982-83

Total Enrollment	No. of Institutions Reporting	% of Total
Fewer than 1,000	88	13.5%
1,000-2,499	161	24.7
2,500-4,999	114	17.5
5,000-9,999	118	18.1
10,000-19,999	111	17.0
20,000-29,999	39	6.0
30,000 and more	21	3.2
TOTAL	652	100.0%

A three way analysis of new teachers prepared, total enrollment, and public/non-public institutions (see Table 3) revealed that the largest cell was non-public institutions under 2500 total enrollment that prepared fewer than 100 teachers each in 1982-83, 179 of the total 652, (27.4%). Almost six in ten of the non-public institutions, 179 of 309 (57.9%), were in that single cell. And, almost three-fourths of the non-public institutions, 230 of 309 (74.4%), prepared fewer than 100 teachers each in 1982-83.

Organization for Teacher Education

Five questions were asked about the intra-institution organization for teacher education program operation, i.e., questions about the location of professional education faculty (the existence of a school or college of education within a university does not, of course, mean that all professional education faculty are housed there; many institutions have "secondary methods professors" in the subject matter departments as will be observed in relation to the locus of

Table 3. Frequencies and Percentages of New Teachers Prepared in Public and Non-Public Institutions by Total Enrollment

f and % of New Teachers Prepared/Public and Non-Public

Enrollments	100 or fewer		101-249		259-499		500 or more		TOTALS		Grand Total
	P	N-P	P	N-P	P	N-P	P	N-P	P	N-P	
Under 2,500	21/3.2*	179/27.4*	17/2.6*	24/3.7*	1/.2*	5/.8*	0/0.0*	2/.3*	39/6.0*	210/32.2*	249/38.2*
2,500-9,999	27/4.1*	46/7.0*	66/10.1*	27/4.1*	47/7.2*	4/.6*	14/2.1*	1/.2*	154/23.6*	78/12.0*	232/35.6*
10,000 or more	4/.6*	5/.8*	33/5.1*	8/1.2*	74/11.3*	3/.5*	39/6.0*	5/.8*	150/23.0*	21/3.2*	171/26.2*
TOTALS	52/8.0*	230/35.3*	116/17.8*	59/9.0	122/18.7*	12/1.8*	53/8.1*	8/1.2*	343/52.6*	309/47.2*	652/100.0
	282/43.3		175/26.8		134/20.5		61/9.3		652/100.0		

Notes: 1. * = % of total sample
2. For this table, two "number of new teachers prepared" categories were collapsed into one (500 or more) and the seven enrollment categories were collapsed into three.

responsibility for offering secondary methods courses), whether there is a separate program of general education and, if so, who formulates that program, the faculty body with policy making responsibility for teacher preparation programs, the administrator responsible for general administration and coordination of teacher education programs, and the locus of responsibility for selected program components for different programs for prospective teachers.

Location of Professional Education Faculty

Over one-half (352, 54.0%) of the respondents reported that their institution had a separate school or college of education and four in ten (261, 40.0%) a department of education in the arts and sciences. The remaining institutions (N=39) indicated some other organizational home for education faculty, e.g., a school of human services, a center for teacher education.

Analyses of responses to this question by the four institutional characteristics revealed that the separate school or college of education is dominant in universities, in 92% of those offering the doctorate and in 72% that do not. The surprising finding was that 57 (one in five) of the four-year colleges reported a separate school or college of education. (It is possible that these respondents were actually reporting a separate department of education). Predictably, the department of education was overwhelmingly reported by respondents in four-year colleges (82% of the departments of education) and institutions that prepared the smallest number of teachers (96% of the departments of education were in institutions that prepared fewer than 250 teachers in 1982-83 and 76% were in institutions that prepared 100 or fewer teachers).

General Education Program

Slightly more than one-half (352, 54.0%) of the institutions did not have a separate program of general education for teacher education students. Universities that

offer the doctorate in education were more likely than the other two types of institutions to have a separate general education program--63% compared to 40%. Public institutions were more likely than non-public to have a separate general education program, 56% to 43%.

In those institutions reporting a separate general education program for teacher preparation, two responses accounted for over 80% of the total regarding responsibility for its formulation: an institution-wide council or committee -- 45%, and faculty in the school, college, or department of education -- 36%. Faculty in the arts and sciences formulated the separate general education program in another 11% of the institutions. A variety of other bodies were reported by the remaining institutions. Of note is that the state department of education was reported by some respondents to set the general education program for teachers. This was not consistently reported by institutions within a given state, leading to the observation that some institutions (obviously) are more sensitive to and defer to/blame the state department more than others.

Policy Making Body

There was a relationship between institution size and the response that "faculty in a school, college, or department of education with professors of education in the majority" was the body with policy making responsibility for programs to prepare teachers (See Table 4). That response was reported overall by 58%. In the two smallest size categories, fewer than 1000 and 1000-2499, less than one half of the respondents, 47%, gave the "education faculty--majority". response. In the two largest size categories, 20,000-29,999 and 30,000 and over, more than seven in ten 71%+, reported that "education faculty--majority" was the faculty body with policy making responsibility for programs. Faculty (or a faculty committee) in a school, college, or department of education with professors

of education in the minority was reported to be the policy making body in less than 10% of the institutions.

An institution-wide council was the second most common response to the policy making question with almost one-third of the institutions reporting that structure as the policy making body. Generally, the smaller the institution, the more likely was this the response.

Table 4. Institution Size and Policy Making Responsibility

Policy Making Body		Fewer than 1000	1,000-2,499	2,500 4,999	5,000 9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-29,999	30,000 or more	Row Total
SCDE-- Education Majority	N	41	75	72	76	70	28	15	376
	Row %	10.9	19.9	18.9	20.2	18.6	7.4	4.0	57.7
	Column %	46.6	46.6	62.3	64.4	63.1	71.8	71.4	
	Total %	6.3	11.5	10.9	11.7	10.7	4.3	2.3	
SCDE-- Education Minority	N	11	20	5	7	3	1	0	47
	Row %	23.4	42.6	10.6	14.9	6.4	2.1	0.0	7.2
	Column %	12.5	12.4	4.4	5.9	2.7	2.6	0.0	
	Total %	1.7	3.1	0.8	1.1	0.5	0.2	0.0	
Institu-tion-wide Council	N	32	57	33	30	34	6	4	196
	Row %	16.3	29.1	16.8	15.3	17.3	3.1	2.0	30.1
	Column %	36.4	35.4	28.9	25.4	30.6	15.4	19.0	
	Total %	4.9	8.7	5.1	4.6	5.2	0.9	0.5	
Other	N	4	9	5	5	4	4	2	33
	Row %	12.1	27.3	15.2	15.2	12.1	12.1	6.1	5.1
	Column %	4.5	5.6	4.4	4.2	3.6	10.3	9.5	
	Total %	0.6	1.4	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.3	
Column Total		86 13.5	161 24.7	114 17.5	118 18.1	111 17.3	39 6.0	21 3.2	652 100.0

Administrative Responsibility

Table 5 contains frequencies and percentages of responses concerning the administrative position responsible for the general administration and coordination of teacher education programs. Overwhelmingly, the dean or department chair of the school, college or department of education was the position reported--603 (of 652), or 92.5%. The vice president for academic affairs was reported by 25 (3.8%) of the respondents, a director of teacher education by 15 (2.3%), and various other positions by 9 (1.4%). The president, a profferred choice, was not selected by any of the respondents.

Cross tabulations revealed that the institutions in which an administrator other than the education dean/department chair was the responsible administrator were predominantly four-year colleges (that also prepared few teachers): 20 of the 25 vice presidential responses and 10 of the 15 director of teacher education responses were from four-year colleges.

Table 5. Administrative Position Responsible for General Administration and Coordination of Teacher Education Programs

Administrative Positions	No. of Institutions Reporting	% of Total
Dean or Department Chair--Education	603	92.5
Vice President for Academic Affairs	25	3.8
Director of Teacher Education	15	2.3
Other	9	1.4
TOTAL	652	100.0%

Locating More Specific Responsibilities

Chief institutional representatives were asked to indicate where (school/college/department or subject matter department) primary responsibility resides for offering methods courses, content courses, for advising, and supervising student teachers for six different teacher preparation programs. (See Table 6).

Elementary. General methods courses for students preparing for elementary teaching were reported to be offered by the school/college/department of education in 587 (90%), and special methods courses in 515 (79%) of the cases. In 580 (89%) of the institutions, the school/college/department of education was responsible for advising elementary education majors, and in 600 (92%) of the responding institutions student teacher supervision was undertaken by the same unit.

Secondary. For students preparing for secondary teaching, the school/college of education was responsible for general methods courses in 572 (87.7%) of the institutions. Responsibility for special methods courses was (practically) equally divided between the school/college/department of education (45.4%) and subject matter departments (42.2%). Subject matter departments were responsible for teaching content courses in a large majority (89.0%) of the institutions. Advising for students preparing for secondary teaching was evenly distributed among three responses: school/college of education (34.2%); subject matter departments (33.4%); and other (30.4%). Supervision of secondary student teachers was assumed by the school/college/department of education in a majority (70.6%) of institutions.

Junior High/Middle School. The school/college/department of education assumed responsibility for junior high/middle school general methods courses in 77.0% of the reporting institutions; special methods courses for junior high/

Table 6. Percentages of Responsibility for Offering Specific Courses, Advisory, and Student Teacher Supervision for Six Programs

Program Courses/Functions	% of Responses for School/College/ Department of Ed.	Subject Matter Department	Other*	N.A.**
A. Elementary				
General Methods	90.0%	3.4%	1.1%	5.5%
Special Methods	79.3%	12.3%	4.4%	4.3%
Advising	89.0%	2.0%	4.9%	4.1%
Stu. Tchr. Supv.	92.0%	0.9%	2.8%	4.3%
B. Secondary				
General Methods	87.7%	5.4%	2.0%	4.9%
Special Methods	45.4%	42.2%	9.7%	2.8%
Content	15.5%	89.0%	3.2%	2.3%
Advising	34.2%	33.4%	30.4%	2.0%
Stu. Tchr. Supv.	70.6%	7.4%	20.4%	1.7%
C. Junior High/Middle School				
General Methods	77.0%	3.1%	1.7%	18.3%
Special Methods	49.2%	26.4%	7.2%	17.2%
Content	10.7%	68.1%	4.1%	17.0%
Advising	43.1%	20.6%	19.6%	16.7%
Stu. Tchr. Supv.	68.7%	3.5%	11.0%	16.7%
D. K-12 Physical Education				
General Methods	66.0%	9.0%	2.3%	23.9%
Special Methods	22.1%	54.3%	2.5%	21.2%
Content	4.0%	72.2%	2.6%	21.2%
Advising	20.4%	39.1%	19.5%	21.0%
Stu. Tchr. Supv.	48.2%	17.3%	13.0%	21.5%
E. K-12 Art				
General Methods	61.7%	11.3%	3.1%	23.9%
Special Methods	22.1%	54.3%	2.5%	21.2%
Content	4.0%	72.2%	2.6%	21.2%
Advising	20.4%	39.1%	19.5%	21.0%
Stu. Tchr. Supv.	48.2%	17.3%	13.0%	21.5%
F. K-12 Music				
General Methods	58.9%	18.3%	2.8%	20.1%
Special Methods	15.3%	63.8%	3.4%	17.5%
Content	4.1%	76.5%	2.1%	17.2%
Advising	16.7%	45.4%	20.7%	17.2%
St. Tchr. Supv.	40.5%	26.8%	15.3%	17.4%

* Respondent write-ins clearly suggest that this response means that responsibility is shared between the school/college/department of education and the subject matter department(s).

** Course or Program not offered

NOTE: In all instances within a subcategory, percentages for an item are based on N=652.

middle school were offered by the school/college/department of education nearly twice as often (49.2%) as by subject matter departments (26.4%). In well over one-half (68.1%) of institutions, content courses were offered by the subject matter departments. Advising junior high/middle school majors was the responsibility of the school/college/department of education in fewer than half (43.1%) of the institutions. In over two-thirds of the institutions (68.7%), the school/college department of education supervised junior high/middle school student teachers.

K-12 Physical Education. General methods courses for prospective teachers of K-12 P.E. were largely (66%) the responsibility of the school/college/department of education in reporting institutions. Special methods classes in K-12 P.E. were reportedly offered by the school/college/department of education in one-third (33.4%) and subject matter departments in four of ten (42.9%) of the institutions. More than twice as many institutions (55.2%) reported that the subject matter departments taught K-12 P.E. content courses as reported those courses taught by the school/college/department of education (21.5%). Advising of K-12 P.E. majors was reported almost equally by the college/school/department of education (32.1%) and the physical education departments (33.0%). Over one-half of the institutions (55.4%) placed responsibility for P.E. student teacher supervision in the school/college/department of education. (It should be noted that many schools and colleges of education include departments/schools of health and physical education.)

K-12 Art. With respect to preparation programs for K-12 art teachers, over one-half of the institutions (61.7%) provided for offering general methods courses through the school/college/department of education, while over one-half (54.3%) depended on subject matter departments to teach special methods courses.

Almost three-fourths (72.2%) of the respondents reported that provide content courses in the K-12 program are offered in the art department. Advising art education majors was the responsibility of the art department 39.1% and of school/college/department of education in 20.4% of the institutions. The supervision of student teachers in art in almost one-half (48.2%) of the institutions was the responsibility of the school/college/department of education.

K-12 Music. Over one-half (58.9%) of the respondents claimed that general methods courses for music teaching students were the responsibility of the school/college/department of education; special methods courses were the responsibility of the music department in almost two-thirds (63.8%) of the cases. Over three-fourths (76.5%) of the institutions reported that content courses in music were offered in the music department. The largest single advising responsibility response for students preparing to teach music was the music department (45.4%). The modal response (40.5%) for student teacher supervision was the school/college/department of education; 26.8% reported that the music department supervised student teachers.

Summary

Chief institutional representatives from 652 (88.5%) of the 7[illegible] colleges and universities that held membership in the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education returned completed questionnaires during the 1983-84 academic year; and data reported were for 1982-83.

343 (52.6%) classified themselves as public and 309 (47.4%) as non-public. Close to one-half (44%) were four year colleges, one-third (31.7%) were non-doctoral degree granting universities, and 24.2% were universities that award a doctoral degree in education.

43.3% of the responding universities graduated fewer than 100 students/year in their teacher education program in 1982-83. A quarter of the schools (28.8%) graduated between 101-249 students while 20.5% graduated between 250-499. Only 9.4% of the institutions graduated 500 or more students. Nearly one-quarter of the responding institutions reported enrollments of 1,000-2,499 students. 26.2% of the institutions reported enrollments of at least 10,000.

Over one-half of the institutions have established a separate school or college of education. The bulk of the rest of the institutions reported that their education faculty (40.0%) were located within a college of arts and sciences--most often the college.

The institutions were fairly evenly divided between having a separate program of general education for teacher education (46%) and not (54%). Of those institutions with a separate general education, 20.6% reported that institution-wide councils or committees established the program. Another 16.6% reported that the separate program was formulated by faculty in the college of education.

Over one-half (57.7%) of the institutions reported that the faculty in the school/college/department of education with professors of education in the majority have the primary responsibility for policy making for programs to prepare teachers. Administration and coordination of teacher education programs was the responsibility of the dean or department head in 92.5% of the institutions.

With respect to teacher preparation programs of all types (i.e., elementary, middle school/junior high, secondary, P.E., art, music), the school/college/department of education was responsible for general methods courses in 73% of the cases. The school/college/department of education was responsible in 43% of the cases for special methods courses (subject matter departments were respon-

sible in 40%). The school/college/department of education was responsible for advising in 39.2% of the cases; subject matter departments were responsible in 28.9% of the cases; and some other arrangement (shared responsibility) was reported by the remaining 208 institutions (31.9%). Subject matter departments were responsible for offering content courses in 72.2% of the responding institutions--the questionnaire did not elicit a response concerning content courses in elementary education programs. The school/college/department of education was responsible for supervision of student teachers in 62.5% of the institutions.

Interpretations

Like the K-12 American public schools, teacher preparation is decentralized and complex across the nation. Fluctuating supply and demand, geographic mobility among students and graduates, and an evolving view of appropriate components all contribute to the existence of significant commonalities in teacher preparation programs.

The assertion that education professors control teacher preparation programs is not supported by our survey. As the survey data reveal, teacher preparation involves faculty from throughout the college/university; thus teacher preparation is an institutional function. Liberal arts professors cooperate and share responsibility (with education professors) for teacher preparation program/policy development in varying ways and degrees. That is especially the case for programs preparing secondary and K-12 art, music, and P.E. teachers and to a lesser degree, middle school/junior high teachers. Cooperation takes the form of subject matter department responsibility for content courses, and varied shared responsibility for methods courses and advising. Only in the elementary teacher preparation programs does the school, college, or department of education have clear responsibility for methods, advising and student teaching. General education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

takes on special significance for elementary teachers and only in 46% of the institutions is that determined by the professional education faculty.

The finding that 54% of the institutions surveyed have a separate school or college of education (over 75% of the universities represented) and that 92.5% of these institutions assign general administration and coordination of the teacher preparation program to the education dean/department chair masks the reality that secondary and K-12 special subject (and to a lesser degree, middle and junior high) programs span department lines in colleges and college lines in universities. Thus, given our survey data which reveal that (1) only 46% of institutions have separate programs of general education for teacher preparation and (2) policy responsibility lies with education professors in 58% of the institutions, but (2a) further analysis of the 58% figure, coupled with what data reveal about institution size, e.g., 55% have fewer than 5,000 students; number of teachers prepared, e.g., 43% prepared fewer than 100 teachers/year, and approximately 70% prepared fewer than 250 teachers/year; and sponsorship, size, and number of teachers prepared, e.g., 58% of nonpublic institutions had fewer than 2,500 students and prepared fewer than 100 teachers/year, we can say that generally TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM CONTROL IS A SHARED RESPONSIBILITY IN VARYING, COMPLEX WAYS AND TO VARYING DEGREES.

Implications

1. Recommendations for change in teacher preparation program organizational structure and policy making must take into account the diversity among the teacher preparation programs. Calls for change are less likely to be heard if they came only from individual programs.
2. Minor changes such as raising admission requirements are within the authority

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of institutions to make, especially in states with the approved program process.

3. Changes within one or more of the major components of preparation programs, can be made by the responsibile professional education unit or subject matter department. That is not to say that total revision of a program component is easy to accomplish, only that the appropriate target for change is relatively clear and confined. For example, a thorough review and revision of the social/philosophical/historical and educational foundations component of teacher education programs might involve an easily identifiable faculty group within a school/college/department of education and, to the extent that the resultant change did not involve expanding that component or impact negatively on other components, the possibilities for and strategies used would be the same as those for/with any faculty group within higher education.
4. Major changes in design, time, requirements, interactions with the field of practice, of necessity require the acquiescence if not support and leadership of subject matter (arts and sciences) faculty and college/university administrators. And, those program changes that would potentially place the institutions in jeopardy vis-a-vis others within a region or state, e.g., a five-year program, will be enhanced if the state agency acts in concert. If a change involves a signficant departure in the nature and extent of interaction with K-12 schools, participation and/or agreement with K-12 school personnel is necessary, e.g. a one-year required internship (with pay) as a requirement for a recommendation for certification.

The prognosis for significant change in teacher education programs has to be less bright, at least in the short run -- without dramatic external events. As the current effort to redesign NCATE reveals, relatively moderate change is slow and difficult at best. Until the national community can exert a more

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

singular voice, there is little reason to believe that the professional education community within institutions will be buttressed by that external force.

Intra-institution efforts at change of a pardigm shift magnitude, which is what was called for in 1976 by the Howsam report and continues to be by many in 1985, cannot be effected (in many instances) by professional education personnel in higher education acting alone. Within institutions of higher education, the coalescing of divergent interest groups around powerful ideas, while difficult, is where the action is.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE